

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated October 11, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10-20, and 22-27 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 6, and 27 have been amended to address minor informalities presented in the Office Action. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims and the new claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 6-8 were objected to for containing informalities. The claims have been amended to address the concerns presented in the Office Action.

Section 112 Rejections

Claim 27 was rejected for containing insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “languages” in the claim. Claim 27 has been amended for clarification.

The Office Action also stated that it is not clear if the phrase “languages” refers to natural languages or programming languages or markup languages. It is unclear from the Office Action how the claims fail to comply with Section 112, second paragraph. It appears that the Examiner is asserting that the claim is indefinite, but it is not apparent how the claim would be indefinite based on the Applicant’s Specification.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-20, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,238 to Giljum et al. (“Giljum”). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites “presenting a user interface adapted to allow a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment, the set of predefined components comprising a library of components that can be selectively enabled, disabled, and customized.” The Office Action states that Giljum discloses a set of predefined items that are stored in a website database that can be manipulated (Office Action, page 8).

However, the Giljum reference teaches that the Web Site Database provides default item types and does not disclose a set of predefined components comprising a library of components that can be selectively enabled, disabled, and customized. The Giljum reference states that all content on the Web Site Database are added as items and when items are added a user specifies its title, display options, and optional information about the item. Thus, the Giljum reference fails to teach presenting a user interface adapted to allow a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components that include a library of components that can be selectively enabled, disabled, and customized. Accordingly, each and every feature of claim 1 is not disclosed by the Giljum reference, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 26, and 27 depend from claim 1 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to be allowable over the Giljum reference. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 26, and 27 also contain additional limitations not taught by the Giljum reference.

For example, claim 7 recites “receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location.” The Office Action states that this feature is taught in figure 23 and column 16, lines 41-45. However, the cited portions of the Giljum reference teach that a user can customize navigation bars for various folders. This is not the same as receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location. Accordingly, claim 7 is further allowable over the cited reference.

As another example, claim 26 recites “the templates include templates for at least one of different countries, different organizational sites, intranet sites, extranet sites, or Internet sites.” The Office Action states that this feature is taught by the Giljum reference in figure 35 and column 11, lines 63-67 by teaching that a user can select or create a custom style. However, the Giljum reference fails to disclose or suggest templates for different countries, different organizational sites, intranet sites, extranet sites, or Internet sites, where a generated web

environment is based on a template. Teaching that a user can create a custom style is simply not the same. Accordingly, claim 26 is further allowable over the cited art.

For at least these reasons, and for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 26, and 27 contain limitations not taught by the Giljum reference. Thus, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable over the Giljum reference.

Independent claim 14 recites limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claim 14 recites the set of predefined components comprising a library of components that can be enabled, disabled, and customized. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claims 1, 7, and 26, claim 14 and its corresponding dependent claims are also allowable over the cited art.

### Section 103 Rejections

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giljum and U.S. Patent No. 7,234,110 B2 to Sumitomo (“Sumitomo”). Claim 27 depends on claim 4, which depends on claim 1. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 1, the Giljum reference fails to teach all the features of the claim. In addition, the Sumitomo reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Giljum reference. Accordingly, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

In addition, claim 27 recites “wherein the library of components include predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.” The Giljum reference does not teach this feature, nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such a limitation. The Sumitomo reference also fails to teach this limitation. Instead, the Sumitomo reference teaches storing dynamic pages corresponding to a plurality of languages. Storing a page in a variety of different languages is not the same as storing predefined components in different languages, where a user is allowed to configure parameters, relating to the set of predefined components, for a web environment. Thus, the Sumitomo reference fails to teach a library of components that includes predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages

Applicant : Jos Jaspers, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/749,421  
Filed : December 31, 2003  
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-051001 / 50-03-009

for presentation in the generated web environment. Accordingly, claim 27 is further allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice. If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth Philip Dahm  
Reg. No. 51,352

Date: December 11, 2007

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 760-6119  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091